



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

90
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,377	10/13/2003	Michael Cohen	LA-6658-109.US	4408
167	7590	08/20/2004	EXAMINER	
FULBRIGHT AND JAWORSKI L L P			CHAMBERS, TROY	
PATENT DOCKETING 29TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
865 SOUTH FIGUEROA STREET				
LOS ANGELES, CA 900172576			3641	

DATE MAILED: 08/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/685,377	COHEN, MICHAEL	
	Examiner Troy Chambers	Art Unit 3641	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner on form PTO-892 has cited the references, they have not been considered.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the chassis having a plurality of openings (claim 1), the outer, impact receiving panel (claim 1), and, the adaptation of each plate for attachment to the chassis (claim 1) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for

Art Unit: 3641

consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show the openings of the vehicle and the means for securing the panels to an opening in said vehicle as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be

notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: the term constitute should be amended to reflect a transitional in accordance with U.S. patent practice. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 6289781 issued to Cohen in view of U.S. 6082240 issued to Middione et al. ("Middione"). Cohen discloses a plurality of composite armored plates 22 for providing ballistic protection for armored vehicles as claimed by the applicant in claims 1-9. The plates are adapted for attachment (capable of attachment) to the chassis of an armored vehicle (by any means of attachment including placement on top of the vehicle) and sized to cover at least one opening contained within a vehicle. The limitation "sized to cover" is interpreted as defining the size of the plate rather than requiring a specific orientation with respect to the opening. Cohen does not disclose an armored combat vehicle chassis having a plurality of openings. Middione discloses a

modular armor mounting system for an armored vehicle 16 having openings (Fig. 2, 4 and 5). At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide the mounting system of Middione (including the openings in the hull of the vehicle). The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to avoid prior art armor mounting systems in which loads were concentrated around the mounting screws.

7. Claims 10, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen and Middione as applied to claims 1-9 above, and further in view of U.S. 6575075 (" '075). The combination of Cohen and Middione is described above. However, not disclosed is the addition of a third backing layer of metal. The '075 patent discloses a third backing layer 50 of aluminum. At the time of the invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to provide the combination of Cohen and Middione with the backing layer of the '075 patent. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide extra protection for the vehicle and occupants therein.

8. Claims 10, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen and Middione as applied to claims 1-9 above, and further in view of U.S. 4131053 issued to Ferguson or GB 2277141 issued to Slater. Cohen and Middione are described above. The combination does not disclose a backing layer comprising a polymeric matrix composite with reinforcing fibers, said fibers selected from the group consisting of carbon fibers, aramid fibers and glass fibers. Both Ferguson and Slater disclose a three layer armor plate with backing layers 13 and 12, respectively. The

Art Unit: 3641


backing layer 13 of Ferguson comprises glass fibers (col. 2, ll. 49-51). The backing layer 12 of Slater comprises glass fiber impregnated with an epoxy resin (pg. 6, ll. 20-23).

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The prior art cited on form PTO-892 are cited as of interest to show similar modular systems.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Troy Chambers whose telephone number is (703) 308-5870. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael J. Carone, can be reached at (703) 306-4198.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-4177. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.



3641
JACK KEITH
PRIMARY EXAMINER